

REMARKS

Paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action provisionally rejected Claims 1 and 2. In response a terminal disclaimer has been submitted with this application signed by the attorney of record. It is hoped that this teminal disclaimer removes any problems created by this provisional rejection.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 15 and 31 under §112, 2nd ¶.

Paragraph 5 rejected claim 15 based on the following three alleged problems: (1) the screen referred to in "said screen" on its line 4 was unclear; (2 it was not clear why the first computer performs the scaling down of images, a second computer displayed them, and then the images were downloaded; and (3) a semicolon was improperly used where a comma would be more appropriate.

With regard to problem (1), the words "recited in Claim 1" have been added to Claim 15 to make it clear which screen was being referred to.

With regard to problem (2), it is not the undersigned attorneys understanding that a method claim which recites functions is limited to the performing of them in the order recited. But the examiner is correct in suggesting that the current order in which the functions are recited makes the claim more difficult to understand. In response, Claim

15 has been amended to place the downloading step before the displaying step.

With regard to problem (3), the semicolon has been replaced with a comma as suggested by the Examiner.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claim 31 because its last paragraph ended in a manner that made the meaning of its last clause unclear and indicated that additional language was intended.

In response the phrase "drawn on said display computer" has been replaced with -drawn on said display computer's screen--. Also the characters ";" and" at the claim's end have been replaced with a period.

It is hoped that with these amendments the reasons for the §112 rejection of Claims 15 and 31 have been removed.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 10, 16, 20, and 32 under §102(e) as having been anticipated by Mott et al.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and all the claims that depend from it clearly recite features not anticipated by Mott. Claim 1 recites

"images and text in said displayed portion of the layout are shown at pixel coordinates that correspond to the positions of said images and text in the layout, as scaled down by said scale factor;"

[The deletion is made in this amendment to correct a grammatical error.]

Thus, in the invention recited in claim 1, both images and text are scaled down. In Mott, as is stated at Col. 7, ln7-8, “[t]ext size is not reduced to avoid rendering unreadable text on the display.” The invention of claim 1 recites laying out both images and text at one resolution and then making a scaled down display of that layout, which maintains its relative sizes and positions (although at a different scale) of both text and image elements. This is very different than what is described in Mott, which changes the size of images and table cells and frames, but not the size of fonts. Thus, as Mott scales the layout it is forced to change the layout because some features are changing in size and others are not.

Because of this significant difference between Mott and what is recited in Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claim 1, and Claims 2-4, 10, and 16 that depend from it, as having been anticipated by Mott are clearly inappropriate.

The Office Action rejected Claim 20 as having been anticipated by Mott. The office action noted that Claim 20 depends from Claim 17, but does not provide any suggestion that Mott discloses features of Claim 17, inherited by claim 20, that relate to screen orientation. Even if such a suggested had been made, it does not appear Mott's disclosure would support it. Furthermore, Claim 20 recites the user selectable scaling of both images and font sizes. It does not appear that Mott discloses user selectable

scaling of fonts. For all these reasons it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 20 as having been anticipated by Mott is inappropriate.

The Office Action rejected Claim 32 as having been anticipated by Mott. As the Office action indicated, except for the fact that claim 32 is a system claim, it is virtually identical to claim 1. For example, Claim 32 includes the above quoted language from claim 1 that indicates a clear distinction over Mott. Because of these similarities, Claim 32 is patentable over Mott for at least the same reasons cited above for claim 1.

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action rejected claims 17-19, 29-31 and 33 as anticipated under §102(e) by Rohrabaugh et al.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 17, and all the claims that depend from it, clearly recite features not anticipated by Rohrabaugh. Claim 17 recites

"displaying in a landscape orientation, in a scaled-down manner, a portion of said web page, including at least some of images and text strings;

"wherein said displaying is performed on a screen of a computer having an operating system that displays an associated graphical user interface on said screen in a portrait orientation;"

The cited portions of Rohrabaugh (Figs. 7A-B, 8A-B, and [0058], [0064]) fail to disclose such a change in

display orientation. All of the cited figures show a web page displayed in the portrait orientation for which the Palm PDA. on which they are shown in the FIGS., is designed.

The most relevant portion of Rohrabaugh's cited text is that in [0102] stating that a web page designed for display on a landscape aspect ratio computer can have differential scaling applied to its height and width to squeeze its width more than its height to make it fit better into a display having a portrait aspect ratio.

But there is an important distinction. This only suggests changing the aspect ratio of the display, not changing its orientation, as is recited in Claim 17. Changing the orientation of the display between portrait and landscape means rotating it by 90 degrees, which is very different than merely squeezing it to change its aspect ratio.

Because of this significant difference it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejection of Claims 17, and claims 18-19, 29-31, and 33 which depend from it, as having been anticipated by Rohrabaugh is clearly inappropriate, and should be withdrawn.

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action rejected Claims 5-6 over the combination of Mott and Betrisey. Since, as is recited above with regard to Claim 1, Mott does not disclose claim 1's recited feature of making a layout of both text and images at one resolution and then displaying the same layout at another resolution. And since Betresey

does not appear to display this aspect either, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Mott and Betrisey fail to disclose this vital aspect of what is recited in Claims 5 & 6, through their dependence on claim 1. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that Paragraph 10's rejection of Claims 5 & 6 is improper.

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action rejected Claim 8 over Mott and Rohrabaugh. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is improper because neither of these two references disclose Claim 8's recited feature, similar to that discussed above with regard to Claim 17, of displaying content in a landscape orientation on a computer having an operating system that displays content in a portrait orientation.

Paragraph 12 of the Office action rejected Claim 15 over Mott and Blumberg.

It is respectfully submitted that a Mott and Blumberg, even when combined fail to disclose the features recited in claim 15. Claim 15 recites a method where a first computer accesses digital content including text and image(s), lays it out the content at a virtual resolution, scales it down, and downloads it to a second computer which displays the scaled down layout.

This is clearly distinguished over Mott because, as is described above, Mott does not scale text at all. In Blumberg text is scaled, but it is scaled on the client. Thus, the server does not download scaled-down text, but presumably text in a scalable, imageless, layout format

with pointers to images. In Blumberg it is the client that does the scaling of the text, and it is the image server that scales images in response to requested from the client. This indicated by FIG. 5 in which the client asks for the download of rescaled images when it changes the scale of the display, but it does not request the download of rescaled text.

Thus it can be seen that neither Mott nor Blumberg, nor their combination, teach one computer laying out digital content containing images and text at one resolution and then downloading a scaled down layout to a second computer which displays it.

Thus it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 15 is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

Paragraph 13 of the Office Action indicated that Claims 7-9, 11-14, and 21-28 would be allowable if written in independent form. In response these claims have been rewritten in independent form. The undersigned thanks the Examiner for these indications of allowable subject matter.

Please charge the fee required for the resulting increase in the number of independent claims to the Porter & Associates deposit account 502110.

It is respectfully submitted that with the above amendments all of the claims of the present application appear to be patentable over the art of record cited against them, and allowance of the current claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Edward W. Porter/

Edward W. Porter
Registration No.28,892
Porter & Associates
24 String Bridge S12
Exeter, NH 03833
617-494-17229